

ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

HALPRIN, TEMPLE, GOODMAN & MAHER

555 12TH STREET, N.W., SUITE 950 NORTH
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20004

(202) 371-9100 TELEFAX (202) 371-1497

HTTP://WWW.HTGM.COM

ORIGINAL

ALBERT HALPRIN
RILEY K. TEMPLE
STEPHEN L. GOODMAN
WILLIAM F. MAHER, JR.

May 1, 2001

JOEL BERNSTEIN

JANICE OBUCHOWSKI
OF COUNSEL

RECEIVED

MAY - 1 2001

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Magalie Roman Salas
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
The Portals
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: Ex Parte Presentation – CC Docket No. 96-45, *Rural Task Force/Joint Board Recommendation*; Nos. 00-256, 96-45, 98-77, 98-166, *Multi-Association Group (MAG) Plan for Regulation of Interstate Services of Non-Price Cap Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers and Interexchange Carriers*


Dear Ms. Roman Salas:

Today, representatives of the Multi-Association Group (the “Group”) met with Samuel Feder of Commissioner Furchtgott-Roth’s office to express support for the Group’s proposed plan for regulating non-price cap incumbent LECs. Marie Guillory, Margot Humphrey, John Rose, David Cohen, and the undersigned attended on behalf of the Group.

The attached summary materials were distributed at the meeting and summarize the content of the meeting. Filings of the Group and others already part of the record in this proceeding also were discussed. Ten copies of this letter and the attachment are enclosed for the use of the Secretary and a copy of this letter and attachment will be provided to Mr. Feder.

If you have any questions on this matter, do not hesitate to call me.

Very truly yours,



William F. Maher, Jr.

Attachment
Enclosures
cc: Mr. Feder

No. of Copies rec'd 0710
List A B C D E

**Presentation of Multi-Association Group
NRTA, NTCA, OPASTCO, and USTA**

**THE RURAL TASK FORCE/JOINT BOARD PROCEEDING SHOULD
NOT CONSIDER THE ACCESS ISSUES POSED IN
THE MULTI-ASSOCIATION GROUP PROCEEDING**

- I. The MAG proceeding, not the RTF/Joint Board recommendation, should address all access charges issues, incentive regulation, and related regulatory issues**
 - Access charge reform is not part of the RTF/Joint Board recommendation, but is one component of the MAG plan, as noted in recent *CLEC Access Charge Order*
 - The MAG plan is designed to resolve interrelated FCC proceedings pending for non-price cap ILECs with an integrated reform package
 - No portion of the MAG plan should be carved out for later consideration
 - Comprehensive proceeding will provide regulatory certainty
 - Designed to reduce obstacles that non-price cap ILECs face in business planning and justifying investments in their networks
- II. The MAG plan accommodates the differences among non-price cap incumbent LECs, the markets they serve, and the costs of service in rural communities**
 - Non-price cap incumbent LECs (ILECs) may elect one of two different mechanisms, Path A and Path B, to recover their interstate costs
 - Path A provides a transition to incentive regulation
 - Path B retains rate of return regulation as an option
 - Each path supports the continued use of NECA's centralized tariff and pooling functions
- III. The MAG plan links access reforms similar to the *CALLS Order* with strengthened enforcement of section 254(g) rate averaging and rate integration**
 - Recognizes that section 254(g) requires availability of all optional calling plans
 - Requires continued elimination of monthly user charges and requires IXC pass-through of access savings in lower long distance rates

- Proposes to set SLCs at comparable levels to those adopted in the *CALLS Order*
- Proposes to reduce non-price cap ILECs' per-minute access charges
- For Path A ILECs, transitions a Composite Access Rate (CAR) to 2.2 cents per minute in the first year, 1.8 cents per minute the second year, and 1.6 cents per minute the third year, a major decrease in per minute access rates comparable to the percentage decrease mandated in the *CALLS Order*
- Adjusts Lifeline support consistent with the *CALLS Order*
- Unlike the *CALLS Order*, is the subject of a conventional rulemaking

IV. The MAG plan responds to the Commission's preference for incentive regulation

- The Path A option proposes a freeze, in real dollars, of ILECs' revenues per line
- Accommodates non-price cap ILECs' need for incentive regulation in a pooling environment
- Targets efficiency incentives to each individual pooling ILEC ready for incentive regulation
- Decreases the disparity in regulation between these ILECs and their competitors

V. The MAG Plan Reforms Universal Service

- New portable RAS support, applicable for Path A, is estimated to be smaller than the \$650 million per year in support created for price cap carriers in the *CALLS Order*, depending on Path A elections
- Removes the current caps on high cost loop support:
 - Current caps reduce the support available to all high-cost ILECs and CLECs whenever any carrier's costs increase
 - Current caps dampen incentives to invest in "reasonably comparable" rural and urban networks